

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed June 18, 2008 has been received and reviewed. Claims 1 through 30 and 32 are noted therein as currently pending in the application. Claim 31 was earlier withdrawn. Claims 12 and 15 have been amended. Reconsideration of the application as amended herein is respectfully requested.

Although the Office Action Summary indicates that claims 1-30 and 32 are rejected in the Office Action, claim 12 is not rejected in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully assert that the absence of a rejection of claim 12 is an indication of allowability. Accordingly, claim 12 has been amended herein to independent form.

### **35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection**

Claim 15 was rejected in the Office Action as assertedly being indefinite under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, for the inclusion of trademark or tradenames therein. Accordingly, claim 15 is amended herein to remove the objected to trademarks and instead specify features of the dry film resists. Support for the amendment may be found at page 4, lines 1 through 4 of the specification. It is requested this rejection be withdrawn and claim 15 allowed.

### **35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Anticipation Rejections**

Claims 1 through 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16 through 19, 26 through 30, and 32 were rejected in the Office Action as assertedly being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0034525 to French et al. ("French").

MPEP § 2136.05 explains that a 35 USC § 102(e) rejection can be overcome by antedating the filing date of the reference by submitting an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.131. Submitted herewith is a Declaration Under 37 CFR 1.131 signed by the inventors of the present application, antedating the filing date of the French reference. It is requested the Declaration be accepted, the application of the French reference under 102(e) be withdrawn, and the claims allowed.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections**

Claims 7 through 9 and 20 were rejected in the Office Action as assertedly being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over French in view of European Patent Application No. 0518422 (“Debakker”). With the French reference withdrawn, it is respectfully submitted these claims are now allowable.

Claims 21 through 25 were rejected in the Office Action as assertedly being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over French in view of Debakker and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,395,678 to Matsushima et al. (“Matsushima”). With the French reference withdrawn, it is respectfully submitted these claims are now allowable.

Respectfully submitted,



Bretton L. Crockett  
Registration No. 44,632  
Attorney for Applicants  
MORRISS O'BRYANT COMPAGNI, P.C.  
734 East 200 South  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101  
Telephone: (801) 478-0071  
Facsimile: (801) 478-0076

Date: December 16, 2008